



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

90
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,097	09/16/2003	John Barrus	20412-07972	6194
758	7590	10/05/2006	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			BOTT, MICHAEL K.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,097	BARRUS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael K. Botts	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-79 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/17/06; 7/13/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is a Final Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: Response A, which was filed on July 17, 2006.
2. Claims 1-79 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 42, 44, and 63 being the independent claims.
3. Claims 1-79 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. Signed and dated copies of applicant's IDS, which were filed on April 17, 2006, and July 13, 2006, are attached to this Office Action.

Claims Rejection – 35 U.S.C. 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-19, 21-54, 56-73, and 75-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,680,223, issued October 21, 1997) [hereinafter "Cooper"], in view of Cotte, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,499,108, issued March 12, 1996) [hereinafter "Cotte"].**

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Cooper in view of Cotte teaches:

A computer-implemented method for processing a stored document, comprising:

receiving an image of a document index;

locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;

identifying a first document based on the location of the first action sticker on the document index page; and

performing the specified first action on the identified first document.

(Cooper teaches the use of a coversheet ("document image index") to access documents that are stored on a computer, and processing the documents as indicated. See, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 4, line 59. Cooper does not expressly teach the use of "stickers" on the coversheet, or "document index image."

Cotte expressly teaches the generation and use of stickers to access and manipulate electronic documents. See, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, generally. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 14, line 48, teaching receiving an image of a document locating an image of a sticker specifying an action, identifying the document based on the location of the sticker on the documents, and performing the specified action.

Cooper and Cotte are combinable because they are both in the same art of document access and manipulation through the use of labels.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Cooper and Cotte. The suggestion or motivation for doing so is found in both references. Cooper identifies a "label" which would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a "sticker." See, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59. In addition, Cotte teaches the use of stickers in a manner consistent with the printing of labels as taught in Cooper. See, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 14, line 48. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cooper with Cotte to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.)

Regarding independent claim 2:

It is noted that the term "collection," and the related term "sub-collection," are not specially defined in the application. From the specification and claims, the Examiner believes the terms to have been intended by the applicants to be used in their usual and ordinary meaning, such as: "a group of objects or works to be seen or kept together." "The American Heritage College dictionary," definition 2 of "collection," Houghton Mifflin Company, Fourth Edition, 2002. As used in the context of a computer or computer stored documents, the term "collection" is believed by the Examiner to be the same as a file. See, "Microsoft Computer Dictionary," Fifth Edition, Microsoft Press, 2002, definition of "file" as follows, in relevant part: "A complete named collection of information, such as a program, a set of data used by a program, or a user-created document." Accordingly, as used in this application, the limitation term "collection," including a "sub-collection," will be read consistent with the definition of a computer "file"

for the remainder of this Office Action.

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, generally. And, see, Cotte, col. 10, lines 28-57, teaching a file, which is a collection. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 4, line 59, teaching manipulation of a collection.

Regarding independent claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching collections identified on the coversheet.

Regarding independent claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching collections identified on the coversheet.

Regarding independent claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. The Examiner takes official notice of the fact that "thumbnail" images were a well known and widely used icons representing software applications and functions and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a thumbnail representation of a document on a document image index coversheet for purposes of

giving visual cues to the user as to the content of the documents represented. See, Bloomberg (U.S. Patent 5,761,686, issued June 2, 1998), col. 3, lines 7-31, teaching that the use of thumbnail images as icons representing documents in applications and functions was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding independent claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59, teaching specified storage locations.

Regarding independent claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 10, lines 13-44, and col. 11, lines 5-12, teaching file manipulation.

Regarding independent claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 15, lines 1-4 teaching updating the index.

Regarding independent claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 15, lines 7-10 teaching storing the new file.

Regarding independent claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching updating the coversheet and locations appropriate to the documents identified thereon.

Regarding independent claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, Figure 13, teaching location and action stickers.

Regarding independent claim 12:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, teaching multiple stickers and multiple "hot zones" as proximate locations for stickers to be read in relation to each other.

Regarding independent claim 13:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically col. 18, line 64 through col. 19, line 35, teaching the use of pointers with stickers.

Regarding independent claim 14:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically Figures 26 through 30, and col. 11, line

24 through col. 13, line 38, teaching the use of "hot zones" for location, along with multiple actions stickers and pointers.

Regarding independent claim 15:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, specifically Figures 26 through 30, and col. 11, line 24 through col. 13, line 38, teaching location of the sticker or icon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to associate location with a coordinate. See also, Cooper, col. 10, lines 45-60.

Regarding independent claim 16:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, figures 12 ad 13, teaching a list.

Regarding independent claim 17:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. The Examiner takes official notice of the fact that "thumbnail" images were a well known and widely used icons representing software applications and functions and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a thumbnail representation of a document on a document image index coversheet for purposes of giving visual cues to the user as to the content of the documents represented. See, Bloomberg (U.S. Patent 5,761,686, issued June 2, 1998), col. 3, lines 7-31, teaching

that the use of thumbnail images as icons representing documents in applications and functions was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding independent claim 18:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching the use of icons on coversheets.

Regarding independent claim 19:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, generally. See also, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, teaching faxing, printing, and e-mailing.

Regarding independent claim 21:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching the use of first and second stickers. See also, Cooper, figures 12 and 13, teaching multiple documents on a coversheet.

Regarding independent claim 22:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59, teaching that a document to be retrieved from a storage device by a coversheet need not necessarily be an electronic document.

Regarding independent claim 23:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, figures 28 and 30 teaching multiple actions.

Regarding independent claim 24:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 9, line 61 through col. 11, line 54, teaching "clipping" as a sub-collection and performing actions user designated actions.

Regarding independent claim 25:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25. See also, Cooper, col. 11, lines 13-31, teaching ordering of actions.

Regarding independent claim 26:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25. See also, Cooper, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching ordering of actions, the actions being sorted according to identification order on the coversheet.

Regarding independent claim 27:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte,

col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, teaching faxing and e-mailing.

Regarding independent claim 28:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching that a user may input data onto a sticker, including destination information.

Regarding independent claim 29:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching that a destination may be represented by an icon or other indication on a sticker, without separate user indication.

Regarding independent claim 30:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching that a destination may be represented by an icon or other indication on a sticker, without separate user indication.

Regarding independent claim 31:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching e-mail and fax.

Regarding independent claim 32:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching scanning in a document index or coversheet.

Regarding independent claim 33:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 13, lines 44-57, teaching receipt of the image index from another computer, which includes via e-mail.

Regarding independent claim 34:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, specifically, col. 13, lines 44-57, teaching receipt of the image of the document via fax.

Regarding independent claim 35:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching reading the first sticker for a specified action.

Regarding independent claim 36:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte,

col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching character recognition.

Regarding independent claim 37:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching the shape of a sticker.

Regarding independent claim 38:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, claim 25, teaching the use of color in the indication field of a label.

Regarding independent claim 39:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, teaching use of an icon in an image label.

Regarding independent claim 40:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, figure 10, teaching a document location.

Regarding independent claim 41:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 23, line 25, and Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 14, line 11, teaching accessing a document from storage before performing operations on the

document.

Regarding **independent claim 42**, Cotte teaches:

A computer-implemented method for processing a stored document, comprising:

receiving an image of a document index;

locating, on the document index image, an image of a sticker;

identifying a first document based on the location of the sticker on the document index page;

receiving input specifying an action; and

performing the specified action on the identified document.

(Claim 42 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 43**:

The rejection of claim 42 is incorporated herein by this reference. See also, Cooper, figure 13, and Cotte, figure 13B, teaching specifying action via a user input.

Regarding **independent claim 44**, Cotte teaches:

A computer program product for processing a stored document, comprising:

a computer-readable medium; and

computer program code, encoded on the medium, for:
receiving an image of a document index;
locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker
specifying an action;
identifying a first document based on the location of the first action
sticker on the document index page; and
performing the specified first action on the identified first document.

(Claim 44 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding independent claim 45:

Claim 45 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 46:

Claim 46 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 47:

Claim 47 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 48:

Claim 48 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 49:

Claim 49 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 50:

Claim 50 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 51:

Claim 51 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 52:

Claim 52 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 53:

Claim 53 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10

and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 54:

Claim 54 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 19 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 56:

Claim 56 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 23 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 57:

Claim 57 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 24 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 58:

Claim 58 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 25 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 59:

Claim 59 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 27 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 60:

Claim 60 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 19 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 61:

Claim 61 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 62:

Claim 62 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 63, Cotte teaches:

*A system for processing a stored document, comprising:
a document index input device, for receiving an image of a document index;
a sticker locator, coupled to the document input index device, for locating, on the document index image, an image of a first sticker specifying an action;
a document identifier, coupled to the sticker locator, for identifying a first document based on the location of the first action sticker on the document index page; and*

a document processor, coupled to the document identifier, for performing the specified first action on the identified first document.

(Claim 63 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1 and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding independent claim 64:

Claim 64 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 65:

Claim 65 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 66:

Claim 66 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 4 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 67:

Claim 67 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 5 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 68:

Claim 68 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 69:

Claim 69 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 70:

Claim 70 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 71:

Claim 71 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 72:

Claim 72 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 10 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 73:

Claim 73 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 19

and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 75:

Claim 75 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 23 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 76:

Claim 76 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 24 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 77:

Claim 77 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 25 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 78:

Claim 78 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 79:

Claim 79 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22 and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. **Claims 20, 55, and 74** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,680,223, issued October 21, 1997) [hereinafter "Cooper"], in view of Cotte, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,499,108, issued March 12, 1996) [hereinafter "Cotte"] as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Johnson, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,267,303, issued November 30, 1993) [hereinafter "Johnson"].

Regarding **independent claim 20**, Cooper in view of Cotte and further in view of Johnson teaches:

Cooper and Cotte teach the limitations of claim 1, but do not expressly teach specifying an access level for the first document.

Johnson teaches the application of a security code to a coversheet, and further teaches individual access codes to be used for document access. See, Johnson, figure 7, and col. 16, line 55 through col. 17, line 36. Specifically, Johnson teaches that the security code segment was only "illustratively shown with a number of check boxes." See, Johnson, col. 17, line 4. Further, Johnson teaches that security code segments could be implemented in a wide variety of ways. See, Johnson, col. 17, lines 10-13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the individual access permissions to set individual access levels for the obvious and beneficial purpose of controlling individuals' access permissions to certain activities such as copying only for those with that job duty, and permission for modifications and deletions to administrators and programmers.

Cooper, Cotte, and Johnson are combinable in that they all deal with the access

and manipulation of electronic documents through coversheets.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Cooper and Cotte with that of Johnson to use code stickers at a particular location for security purposes. The suggestion or motivation for doing so is the obvious and beneficial advantage of document security through individual access permissions and individualized access levels based on the requirements of individual employment duties or access rights.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the cited prior arts to result in the invention specified in claim 20.

Regarding independent claim 55:

Claim 55 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 74:

Claim 74 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 20, and is rejected along the same rationale.

7. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed July 17, 2006 have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive.

Regarding rejections of claims 1, 42, 44, and 63:

Applicants argue that with respect to claim 1 as exemplary of claims 44 and 63, the following:

FIRST: Applicants argue that "Cooper does not provide any hint or suggestion of a technique for performing an action on a document." See, Remarks, pages 22-25.

The Examiner disagrees.

Cooper expressly teaches the use of the label to store a file, col. 3, line 41, access a file for sending, retrieving, deleting, etc., col. 4, lines 6-7, identify a file for fast character recognition, col. 4, lines 23-37, and to initiate computer program instructions, col. 4, lines 38-54.

SECOND: Applicants argue that Cooper teaches away from the claimed invention of claim 1, "where the action and target of the action are both specified based on the single use action of placement of a particular sticker at a particular location." See, Remarks, page 22.

The Examiner disagrees.

Cooper combined with Cotte teach the invention. Cooper teaches the use of a coversheet ("document image index") to access documents that are stored on a computer, and processing the documents as indicated. See, Cooper, col. 1, line 8 through col. 4, line 59. Cooper does not expressly teach the use of "stickers" on the coversheet, or "document index image."

Cotte expressly teaches the generation and use of stickers to access and manipulate electronic documents. See, Cotte, col. 2, line 29 through col. 3, line 54, generally. See also, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 14, line 48, teaching receiving an image of a document locating an image of a sticker specifying an action, identifying the document based on the location of the sticker on the documents, and performing the specified action.

Cooper and Cotte are combinable because they are both in the same art of document access and manipulation through the use of labels. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Cooper and Cotte. The suggestion or motivation for doing so is found in both references. Cooper identifies a "label" which would have been understood by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a "sticker." See, Cooper, col. 3, line 23 through col. 4, line 59. In addition, Cotte teaches the use of stickers in a manner consistent with the printing of labels as taught in Cooper. See, Cotte, col. 10, line 19 through col. 14, line 48. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Cooper with Cotte to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding rejections of claims 20, 55, and 74:

FIRST: Applicants re-assert the arguments made in regard to claim 1, above.

See, Remarks, page 26.

The Examiner disagrees for the reasons cited in support of the rejection of claim 1, above.

SECOND: Applicants argue That Johnson fails to teach an "access level" as specified in claims 20, 55, and 70.

The Examiner disagrees.

Johnson teaches the application of a security code to a coversheet, and further teaches individual access codes to be used for document access. See, Johnson, figure 7, and col. 16, line 55 through col. 17, line 36. Specifically, Johnson teaches that the security code segment was only "illustratively shown with a number of check boxes." See, Johnson, col. 17, line 4. Further, Johnson teaches that security code segments could be implemented in a wide variety of ways. See, Johnson, col. 17, lines 10-13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the individual access permissions to set individual access levels for the obvious and beneficial purpose of controlling individuals' access permissions to certain activities such as copying only for those with that job duty, and permission for modifications and deletions to administrators and programmers.

Cooper, Cotte, and Johnson are combinable in that they all deal with the access and manipulation of electronic documents through coversheets.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have combined the teachings of Cooper and Cotte with that of Johnson to use code stickers at a particular location for security purposes. The suggestion or motivation for doing so is the obvious and beneficial advantage of document security through individual access permissions and individualized access levels based on the requirements of individual employment duties or access rights.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the cited prior arts to result in the invention specified in claim 20.

In response to Applicants' inquiry regarding how Johnson teaches "access levels," it is implicit in individual security accesses that there be at least one level of access, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that a personalized security access code would have been able to be used with more than one level of secure access.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100